

10
~51. A process according to claim 48 including the
further step of limiting the use of the process to store data
from individual callers during a specific interval of time.

11
~52. A process according to claim 42 including the
further step of storing a billing identification number as at
least part of said identification data for a caller.

12
~53. A process according to claim 42 including the
further step of aborting the interfacing step on command of a
caller by a specific answer signal to provide person-to-person
communication.

R E M A R K S

Claims herein are 42 through 53, all of which are
freshly presented to define applicant's process. Formal
reconsideration is respectfully requested on the basis of the
claims, the following comments and the recent interview.

Applicant appreciates the courtesy and time freely
given by Examiner during the recent interview. In that regard,
modifications to the specification and drawings were discussed
regarding the word "cue" and those amendments are provided by
this paper. The drawings are being corrected and will be
transmitted in the next few weeks.

Further to the interview, the claims here are
presented definitive of applicant's invention in the form of a

process rather than an apparatus. The modification is pursuant to the discussions of the interview; however, the present claims 42 through 53 generally parallel the apparatus claims as previously submitted and treated with respect to the prior art.

Also during the interview, Examiner raised several additional items of art which are treated in detail below.

Specifically, the identified references are as follows:

<u>U.S. Pat. No.</u>	<u>Inventor(s)</u>
4,439,636	Newkirk et al.
4,489,438	Hughes
4,559,415	Bernard et al.
4,587,379	Masuda
4,625,276	Benton et al.
4,630,200	Ohmae et al.
4,630,201	White
4,634,809	Paulsson et al.
4,654,482	DeAngelis

Recapitulating to some extent, applicant's development involves a number of meaningful distinctions which enable the accomplishment of a distinct functional capability as treated in detail in Paper 3 (Amendment dated March 2, 1988). Specifically, the development incorporates the functions of: (1) personal participation screening, (2) participant record development, and (3) analytical interrelated data processing with respect to developed records. As defined in the claims, the process steps to enable the distinct functional capability

of applicant's development generally involve the interfacing along with the generation and registration of signal-represented data in the form of answer data, sequence data and identification data. Furthermore, the processing of the data is significant in the manner of interrelated comparisons and analysis with respect to external data that is distinct from the answer data. With these distinctions as background, the references cited by Examiner during the interview are treated below.

The Newkirk et al. patent (4,439,636) is directed to a system for enabling a magnetic stripe card to be used at a pay telephone somewhat independently of the composite telephone system. Although the Newkirk patent discloses digital communication between a remote terminal and a central terminal, the communication essentially involves the magstripe of a credit card. Distinct from applicant's development, Newkirk does not contemplate any operations related to statistical analysis. Specifically, with respect to the claims herein, while the Newkirk patent utilizes a calendar clock and forms records for purposes of billing, the system does not store any form of "answer data". Furthermore, the system certainly does not contemplate interrelated processing as by comparing answer data or analysis of such data with external data. Such limitations are clearly set forth as steps in the pending claims.

The Hughes patent (4,489,438) discloses a voice-digital interface between a caller and a central computer. The

caller provides digital data by using the tone push-buttons of the telephone terminal and the system provides voice information by use of a speech synthesizer. Although the system is pertinent to applicant's development in that regard, it certainly is distinct.

Applicant's development incorporates a digital-voice interface operation and could utilize techniques as disclosed in the Hughes patent. However, applicant's system goes far beyond the teachings or suggestions of the reference. Specifically, Hughes is void of any teaching that would suggest the development and processing of data in accordance with applicant's invention as specifically defined by applicant's process steps involving the initiating of specific files and the processing of data in relation to such files.

Note that a key aspect of the Hughes system resides in an interrupt circuit which senses critical junctures for commanding subsequent operations. Essentially, on detecting such a situation, the "interrupt circuit" actuates the system to initiate a distinct alternative course of action. The claims herein are distinct.

The Bernard patent (4,559,415) discloses a process for charging a fee for calls to a data bank. That is, the patent discloses a system for levying an appropriate charge to obtain information from a data bank as for news, weather, directions and so on. Distinct from applicant's development,

Bernard is void of any teaching related to the acquisition and processing of statistical data.

The Masuda patent (4,587,379) discloses a telephone terminal incorporating a magnetic stripe reader for checking the status of the card. Essentially, the reference system automates the operation of checking that is performed prior to entering a commercial transaction supported by a credit card. Again, the patent neither discloses nor suggests interrelated processing of data to select a subset or any form of statistical analysis in accordance with applicant's development as distinctly claimed.

The Benton et al. patent (4,625,276) discloses a funds transfer system utilizing an optical interface. A special form of telephone terminal is provided to accomplish data transfers between individual modules. As with several other references, the disclosure is void of statistical analysis steps as now claimed herein.

The Ohmae et al. patent (4,630,200) discloses an electronic card-controlled cash register with a telephone link to a central processor. Again, the disclosure is specific and void of teachings related to the statistical analysis or processing of data.

The White patent (4,630,201) discloses another funds transfer system involving a card transaction apparatus ("transactor") and a central processor. The patent discloses combining transaction numbers and random numbers to provide a

security code; however, again the reference is void of teachings or suggestions involving the statistical analysis of data received from remote sources.

The Paulsson et al. patent (4,634,809) discloses an electronic mail system incorporating a tracking or registering technique to account for the individual locations of persons who may be paged. As with the other references, Paulsson is relevant insofar as aspects of the communication; however, it is distinct by a lack of any statistical processing steps of a process.

Finally, the DeAngelis patent (4,654,482) discloses a telephone sales system utilizing a very special form of terminal (device 10) which incorporates a wand for reading data from a merchandise catalog. The communication is interesting in relation to applicant's process; however, it does not involve the voice-digital interface of applicant's system, does not provide sequence signals and does not statistically process data by interrelating answer data.

In summary, the claims herein are submitted to define a patentable process involving multiple steps which in combination clearly distinguish the record art. Somewhat key distinctions include the digital-vocal interface and the provision of external data. However, more significant distinctions with respect to a greater number of references include the distinctions of providing sequence signals, initiating files and storing three distinct forms of data and analyzing the data on

the basis of comparison to select a subset of callers in relation to external data. Accordingly, Examiner's review of the case is respectfully requested with a view toward allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

B. G. Nilsson

B. G. Nilsson
Registration No. 17,350

Docket No. 3194-102A
(213) 977-1001